

App. No. 10/648,530
Amendment Dated: December 14, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of September 14, 2004 states that claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The Office Action also states that claims 2, 10, and 17 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-20 remain in this application for consideration. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 15, 16 and 20 are currently amended. No new matter has been added.

I. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 20 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruznyak (USPN 4,697,097). Applicant respectfully disagrees as explained below.

Amended independent claims 1, 9 and 16 each recite a first resistance circuit and a second resistance circuit sharing a common node. (e.g., Claim 1 recites, "... a first resistance circuit coupled between a first node and a second node ..." and "... a second resistance circuit coupled between the first node and a third node ..."; Claims 9 and 16 each recite, "... a first resistance circuit that is coupled between a first node and a second node ..." and "... a second resistance circuit that is coupled between the first node and a third node ...") (Emphasis added)

Ruznyak does not disclose a first resistance circuit or a second resistance circuit. Such a recitation cannot be inferred from the transistor logic shown in the prior art reference. Neither does the reference recite any of the transistor logic as operating to provide a resistance. Accordingly, since Ruznyak does not include all of the limitations recited in the independent

App. No. 10/648,530
Amendment Dated: December 14, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2004

claims, Ruzynak does not anticipate amended claims 1, 9 and 16. Reconsideration of amended claims 1, 9 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Additionally, claims 3, 8, 11, 15, 18 and 20 ultimately depend from claims 1, 9 and 16, respectively. Claims 1, 9 and 16 are clearly allowable as set forth above, and as such, claims 3, 8, 11, 15, 18 and 20 are also allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration of claims 3, 8, 11, 15, 18 and 20 is also respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 18-20 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chung (USPN 5,959,477). Applicant respectfully disagrees as explained below.

As previously stated with regard to the previous rejection, amended independent claims 1, 9 and 16 each recite a first resistance circuit and a second resistance circuit sharing a common node (e.g., the first node). The resistors (R1, R2) disclosed in Chung do not anticipate this limitation of the amended independent claims. Examining Figure 3 of Chung illustrates that R1 is coupled between transistor 18 and ground, while R2 is coupled between transistor 26 and node coupled to capacitor 30 and transistor 24. There is not teaching or suggestion that the Chung circuit could be modified to achieve the claimed circuit of the present invention. Accordingly, since Chung does not include all of the limitations recited in the independent claims, Chung does not anticipate amended claims 1, 9 and 16. Reconsideration of amended claims 1, 9 and 16 is respectfully requested.


App. No. 10/648,530
Amendment Dated: December 14, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2004

Additionally, claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 18-20 ultimately depend from claims 1, 9 and 16, respectively. Claims 1, 9 and 16 are clearly allowable as set forth above, and as such, claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 18-20 are also allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration of claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 18-20 is also respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.


Joshua W. Korver
Registration No. 51,894
Direct Dial: 206.342.6257

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

